

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE
March 8, 1963

The University Senate met at 2 pm, March 8, 1963, President Carroll presiding.

Inasmuch as the minutes of the previous meeting had been circulated, the minutes were not read, but were approved without objection, as distributed.

Mr. Robert G. Dixon raised a question about the use of titles of individuals mentioned in the minutes. President Carroll stated that it would be resolved by using the title "Mister" for members of the faculty and reserving the title "Doctor" for Doctors of Medicine.

Miss Virginia Kirkbride invited members of the Senate and of the Faculty Assembly to a Panhellenic Association tea in honor of President and Mrs. Carroll on Wednesday, March 27th, from 3:00 to 5:00 pm in Lisner Lounge.

Dr. John Parks invited the Senate to an institute on Appraisal of Teaching Techniques with Application to Medical Education on April 12th and 13th in Lisner Auditorium. The institute is under the direction of Dr. Thomas M. Peery, Director of the Educational Facilities Study, George Washington University School of Medicine. Mr. Francis Keppel, U. S. Commissioner of Education, will be the keynote speaker. There is no registration fee for the institute. There will be a subscription dinner on Friday, April 12th. President Carroll noted that the program is not limited to the field of medicine. The Friday sessions will deal with teaching challenges, in general, at higher educational levels.

Mr. Roderic H. Davison, Chairman of the Executive Committee, reminded the Senate that there will be two more Senate meetings this year and then made the following announcements:

1. At the April meeting the Senate will be asked to choose a committee to nominate for election at the May meeting members of the Executive Committee for next year.
2. At the April meeting the Student Council will be asked to present its annual report.
3. Chairmen of the Senate Committees are asked to prepare brief written reports on their committees' progress and future plans, and to send these to the Executive Committee for presentation at the May meeting.
4. As the second Friday in April falls on a school holiday, the Senate meeting will be held on another date to be decided by the Executive Committee. (The date chosen is Thursday, April 11, 1963.)

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Chairman Davison nominated Mr. David C. Green of the Law School to replace Mr. Gust Angelo Ledakis on the Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom for the balance of this term. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dixon and carried.

Mr. Wood Gray raised, at the February 8th meeting of the Senate, a question concerning the wording recorded in the minutes of the meeting of December 14, 1962, of the Trustees' action with regard to the extension of tuition scholarships for children

of tenure members of the Faculty. The Senate referred the matter to the Committee on Appointments, Salaries and Promotions Policy for further study, consultation with the Provost and recommendation. Mr. Morris S. Ojalvo, Chairman of the Committee on Appointments, Salaries and Promotions Policy, reported his committee had studied the matter and recommended that the words "of the widows" contained in the Board of Trustees' statement should be deleted. After some discussion, Mr. Ojalvo moved that the following wording be recommended to the Board of Trustees:

"the present plan of undergraduate scholarships for dependent children of tenure members of the faculty be extended to include dependent children of faculty members who are in emeritus status and dependent children of deceased tenure members of the faculty."

Mr. Philip H. Highfill, Jr., seconded the motion and it was carried.

Mr. Robert C. Willson, Chairman of the Committee on Student Relationships, reported that his committee had met with Vice President Brown, who had asked the committee to take an inventory of non-academic, student-related physical resources of the University. The committee is meeting with representatives from other institutions to learn of their experiences and will meet with the Student Council within the next few weeks. Vice President Brown announced that next year the University will provide some bus service for the girls living in residence halls at McLean Gardens. Chairman Davison recommended that this committee consult with the Committee on Athletics and the Committee on Physical Facilities.

Mr. Theodore P. Perros, Chairman of the Committee on Athletics, presented the majority report of the committee on intercollegiate athletics, intramural activities and physical fitness. Mr. Monroe Freedman presented a minority report. After considerable discussion of both reports, Mr. Dixon moved that the reports be returned to the committee for further study. The motion was seconded by Mr. John W. Brewer and carried. It was the sense of the Senate that the committee should obtain more information about scholarship and athletic grant-in-aid programs, and that the next report should be duplicated and distributed to the Senate prior to the meeting at which it will be discussed.

Mr. Willson asked if there was anything which the Senate would like him to discuss when he meets with the Student Council. President Carroll suggested that the Council encourage the student body as Spring approaches to be conscious of collegiate dress appropriate to the type and location of this University. He also suggested that members of the Senate might inform Mr. Willson if they had any further suggestions.

President Carroll commented on an article entitled "Academic Common Market" in Time magazine (Feb. 22, 1963) concerning cooperation on the graduate study level among eleven Midwestern universities. He spoke about the exploratory study being conducted by Dr. Arthur S. Adams for the five universities in the District under a grant from the Meyer Foundation. Dean Arthur Burns has been serving as the University's liaison with Dr. Adams.

as recommended by the Ad Hoc Faculty Advisory Committee as its unanimous first choice.

The Provost announced the appointment of Dr. Francis Hamblin as Dean of the School of Education. Dr. Hamblin is replacing Dean James H. Fox, who had submitted his resignation as dean last year because of ill health. President Carroll expressed the hope that Dean Fox would be helped by his forthcoming operations.

Provost Colclough reported that Dean Benson's recent operation was successful and that he was making a satisfactory recovery.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Frederick R. Houser
Frederick R. Houser
Secretary of the Senate

RESOLUTION

On the basis of the report presented by the ad hoc committee and its further discussion, the University Senate has reached the following conclusions:

1. Even though no special formal procedure existed for handling this case, Dr. Reichard was given fair and extended hearings before a number of University bodies, beginning with the History Department.
2. A persistent effort was made throughout to enable Dr. Reichard to clarify the position he had taken before the House Un-American Activities Committee so that his connection with the University would not be adversely affected. It is evident that, for reasons of his own, Dr. Reichard chose not to avail himself of the opportunities so provided.
3. Those faculty, administration, and trustee colleagues who acted in the Reichard matter command our full confidence. They approached their task in a thoroughly impartial manner. They acted in full harmony throughout.
4. A formal procedure should be developed for all separation cases affecting a faculty member, whether or not a particular case might involve the issue of dismissal. The Senate's Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom is taking steps to assure that this purpose will be achieved.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS
Minority Report

I am unable to join the Committee in its report for the following reasons:

1. The Committee reports to the Faculty Senate that "the University's total athletic program now in operation is in the best interests of this institution." In my opinion, we have not made a sufficient investigation and analysis to justify this conclusion. The present Committee has met together for lunch approximately four times. However pleasant ~~as~~ these lunches have been, they have hardly provided us with the necessary data for any broad conclusions regarding the relationship of the University's total athletic program to the best interests of the University. For the same reasons, of course, I am not prepared to say that our present athletic program is not in the best interests of the University. We simply do not know one way or the other.

2. The Committee recognizes that it is difficult to assess the impact of intercollegiate athletics on student enrollment. However, the Committee appears to find significance in increased enrollment from broad areas ("New England, the mid-west, and Texas") in which we have played games. However, the relationship between increased enrollment and games is at best tenuous, particularly in view of increased college enrollment generally. Moreover, the figures are something less than impressive. Of the New England states from which figures have been considered by the Committee, in the two-year period between 1960 and 1962, we increased enrollment from Connecticut by only 38 students and from Massachusetts by only 40 students. During the same period, we suffered a decline in enrollment of 2 students from New Hampshire, 4 students from Vermont, and 11 students from Maine. It is certainly doubtful that the expense of athletic scholarships, and of transportation costs of numerous students and coaches, are justified by these figures. When a team visits us from Indiana, for example, we pay the expenses of all of their players and coaches (as they do when we visit them). One can conceive of less expensive ways of suffering a decline in enrollment of 12 students, as has occurred in our enrollment of students from Indiana between 1960 and 1962.

3. I am most concerned about the relationship between athletic scholarships and academic scholarships. The Committee has

declined to consider this subject at all on the ground that it is a "budgetary" matter. One can hardly conceive, however, of anything more "budgetary" than the imposition of a student activities fee (which the Committee has recommended in the past) or the construction of a student activities building (which the Committee recommends in its present report). The Committee has also questioned whether it is within its jurisdiction, rather than that of some other committee, to consider the subject of athletic scholarships. Yet, here again, the Committee has not hesitated to recommend a student activities building, despite the fact that such a building would include considerably more than athletics, and despite the fact that the Building Committee and other committees might well be deemed to have primary jurisdiction. I would recommend that the Faculty Senate designate the Athletic Committee or any other appropriate committee to make a thorough study of whether athletic scholarships are out of proportion to academic scholarships.

Since the suggestion has been made by one member of the Committee that I am opposed to intercollegiate athletics in general, I would assure the Faculty Senate that this is not the case. I participated in intercollegiate athletics with a great deal of pleasure and pride. My present concern is with the broader issue of whether we are proceeding most efficiently toward creating the finest possible academic institution. If the Faculty were to foreclose itself from such basic matters as the relationship between athletic and academic scholarships, it would fail in its responsibilities in the achievement of this goal, and I would see little if any function to be served by a Faculty Senate.

4. In the entire history of this University no Negro has ever been granted an athletic scholarship. In view of the high performance of many Negro athletes, and the fact that numerous schools of excellent quality find many Negroes worthy of scholarship aid, the University's history in this regard seems to stretch coincidence a bit far. Since the Committee has made no study of this matter, I do not think we are prepared to make any report to the Faculty Senate. However, I would recommend that the Faculty Senate designate this Committee or some other appropriate committee to make a study of our recruitment program relating to athletic scholarships, and to report back its findings regarding possible discrimination against potential Negro scholarship holders.

5. A closely related problem came to light when I asked six varsity athletes why we do not have more Negroes on our teams. Each of them replied that it was his understanding that the University

Minority Report

-3-

discriminates against Negroes in its intercollegiate athletic program in compliance with rules of the Southern Conference. I do not purport to know whether the students' understanding is correct. I do know that this understanding, or misunderstanding, exists on the part of the students. I agree with President Carroll, who stressed in his inaugural address that "the fundamental value of American life" *of id* relating to equal opportunity regardless of race, religion or national origin, should not be "taken for granted", but should be "vigorously taught as the concept that underpins all others in the political, economic, and social life of our nation". I also share with President Carroll his concern with our "inability to articulate" our principles in this regard. I would therefore recommend that the Faculty Senate take immediate steps to make it clear to all of our students, by an appropriate public statement, that the University neither believes in nor practices racial discrimination in intercollegiate athletics or in any other area. Such a statement would be consistent with President Carroll's inaugural address in any event. In view of student misunderstanding on this issue, such a statement is not only appropriate but imperative.

*+ what this
fundamental
value*

Respectfully submitted,

Monroe H. Freedman
Associate Professor of Law

March 6, 1963

cc: Professor T. P. Ferros, Corcoran 205
Dr. Howard Pierpont, GW Hospital
Dr. James Sites, GW Hospital
Professor Joseph Krupa, Hldg. S-11
Professor Lynn George, Hldg. H-30
Professor Wood Gray, Govt. 406

REPORT OF THE SENATE
COMMITTEE ON ATHLETICS

The Senate Committee on Athletics submits the following report on intercollegiate athletics, intramural activities and physical fitness.

Intercollegiate Athletics - The document submitted to the Senate in April, 1962 entitled "A Statement on Intercollegiate Athletics" reflects the results of a year long study made by the committee selected by former President Marvin to respond to the request of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools for a statement by the University on its philosophy towards intercollegiate athletics. This committee included Dr. Brigulio (Medicine) and Professors Coberly (English), Kennedy (Government and Business), Perros (Chemistry) and Weaver (Law). This statement considers among other topics, the disadvantages and benefits derived from participation in intercollegiate athletics, the reasons for membership in the Southern Conference and the role of the student-athlete. The report was adopted by the administration and accepted by the Middle States Association as responsive to its request.

The Senate Committee feels that this statement is still a valid one and is consistent with the university's total program.

Although it is dangerous to cite selected portions of a document which should be read in its entirety in order for one to derive a full understanding of its message, the committee wishes to bring to the attention of the Senate a few passages from this report as a preface to some comments which are to follow.

"To begin with, Universities may be legitimately concerned with the improvement of bodies as well as minds. This is shown by the requirements for physical education for all students, the intramural programs for all who wish to participate, the facilities offered to students who want to use them informally. (Unfortunately, we are sadly lacking in this last respect.) Intercollegiate competition as such is desirable too. This is simply a matter of giving the better students in each school the advantages which flow from stiffer competition than they could get within their own school.

In addition, in this country the school teams have become tangible symbols of the institution as a whole. Students, faculty, alumni and friends of the school

identify themselves with the team although they may know none of the individual players and may have no wish or ability to play the game themselves. Kept within bounds, this is desirable, but it has been frequently abused."

The following is an additional excerpt from this document.

"Like it or not (and we do not), public opinion plays an important role. In the minds of a large segment of the public (including potential students, their parents, their teachers, and other potential supporters of the school), the image of the school is in a measure a reflection of its portrayal on the sports pages of the daily newspaper (addendum: radio and television). This image influences the attitude of these people toward the school in non-athletic respects and, thus, athletics has an impact on other university objectives in a way and to a degree quite different from other extra-curricular activities. This may be deplored, but it is one of the facts of life and, therefore, it too must be considered, although again, it cannot be decisive."

A final brief excerpt are these two sentences.

"It seems clear to the committee that there is no single wise approach to intercollegiate athletics. Rather, each institution must formulate its own approach, keeping in mind the history of athletics at that school, the school's membership, if any, in a conference and the responsibilities which go with that role, the impact of intercollegiate athletics on promotion of the objectives of the school generally, and the measure of a respectable showing for that school."

With this as a background, it is pertinent to mention several items which are not covered fully in this document.

One of the objectives of our scheduling intercollegiate competitions is to take teams from time to time into areas some distance from Washington so that the name of the university may be publicized and also to offer the alumni in these regions an opportunity to renew ties by watching our teams play. During the past few years, the university's squads have played in Massachusetts, Florida, Louisiana, Texas, Michigan, Kansas, Colorado and Utah. It is difficult to assess the impact of such visits but it is perhaps a little more than a coincidence that the student enrollment from New England, the mid-west and Texas at this university has increased in

the past few years.

An important contribution to the public relations program of the university is provided by the members of the coaching staffs to a very large degree and to a lesser extent but of equal value by the faculty of the Physical Education Departments. During the course of the academic year, these representatives of this institution appear as the principal speakers at over 100 high school parent-student banquets or civic club meetings in Washington and the neighboring states. The attendance at these events varies from 50 to 500. This is an opportunity to present the unique advantages which the university offers to prospective students in a direct and personal manner to a degree not offered by any other avenue to George Washington at the present time. It would be difficult to assess the value of such appearances but its beneficial aspects would be equally difficult to deny.

Alumni support of a university is very important. Locally, Colonials Incorporated uses the intercollegiate games as the basis for scheduling receptions and other events at which friends and alumni gather. This organization consists of alumni and friends who state openly their interest in the institution's intercollegiate athletic program and its use as an instrument for creating support for the university. Last spring, Colonials Inc. gave an unrestricted gift for \$1000.00 to President Carroll to emphasize the organization's recognition of the importance of financial contributions to the development of this institution. Perhaps it is of significance to mention that some of the more prominent business and professional men of the Washington area are members of this group.

In connection with this, it should be pointed out that local business concerns have sponsored the radio broadcasts of the university's football games and recently, the basketball games, too. The broadcasts are heard over stations WOL and WMAL respectively.

The George Washington University is a member of the Southern Conference and the National Collegiate Athletic Association. The NCAA is the regulatory body for intercollegiate athletics. The member institutions must abide by the rules and regulations of the Association. At present, there are over 600 colleges and universities which belong to the NCAA. In order to be eligible for membership, the

institution must be accredited, must participate in at least four intercollegiate sports and have a coaching staff which can provide the necessary instruction to the students.

Many of the abuses and shortcomings of intercollegiate athletics have been eliminated or sharply curtailed by the actions taken by this body during the past decade, and more effectively during the past five years. Excesses in the areas of financial assistance, eligibility, and student promotion practices have been legislated against and it can be said with a measure of conviction that, within a few years, sensible administration of intercollegiate athletics will prevail on a national scale.

One of the strongest criticisms hurled at intercollegiate athletics is the procedure of recruiting students with talent in certain sports to attend an institution by granting him financial assistance in the form of tuition and board fees. In order to obtain a proper perspective of this matter, it is best to recall the origin of this practice. Many years ago, over-zealous alumni began to entice high school seniors with exceptional talents in football to attend their respective universities by offering them all sorts of financial inducements. Although this action had elements of good intentions, it soon became excessive and it resulted inevitably in a number of scandals. Without a doubt, this had much to do in casting a shadow over collegiate football contests specifically and upon intercollegiate athletics in general.

Before a coordinated action was taken by the colleges, universities and the NCAA to correct these actions, the procedure of granting financial assistance to student-athletes in the form of tuition and board as a minimum had become an established policy in all major institutions. Further, the granting of such assistance was not limited to football but it was extended to all sports activities.

Shortly after World War II, the NCAA began to take restrictive action toward this practice. Today, there are specific limitations on a national scale as to what the student-athlete may be granted. Any subversive alumni activity which attempts to circumvent these restrictions can lead to the suspension of the institution's right to participate in any NCAA sponsored events.

In spite of the present sensible approach to this matter, criticism at the mere granting of financial assistance on any basis other than that of scholarship is still heard. In a narrow sense, this is a valid commentary. In a broader sense, it is not. It should be pointed out that the day whereby a student gains admission to an institution on the basis of athletic talents alone is rapidly coming to an end. The increased standards for entrance into a college or university has been well publicized in the secondary schools and it is well known to the student-athletes that they must be scholastically strong if they are to be considered for any assistance. Indeed, the trend in colleges and institutions is to award financial assistance to students in areas in addition to sports if these activities add substantially to the concept of student life as it has evolved in this nation. Thus, grants-in-aid are provided in many institutions for students in the dramatic arts, the marching band, speech, and music.

Another criticism of this system is that the students are all enrolled in the School of Education as majors in Physical Education. Aside from the fact that this is untrue (at this institution about 30% are), this belief tends to convey the impression that those who are enrolled are incapable of coping with any other discipline. This is quite unfair and tends to obscure the important fact that the need for capable physical education instructors in the secondary schools and colleges is a vital one. We should be quite proud of the fact that this institution has two outstanding departments of Physical Education which rank among the best on the east coast, if not in the nation. No better testimony can be made than to cite the fact that the requests for our graduates each year exceeds the number of graduates. It is fitting here to remark that the Peace Corps complimented the Physical Education Department of this institution by stating that the trainees who were here last summer departed from Washington in the best physical condition of any group which they have had.

Perhaps a word should be offered with regard to Conferences. There are twelve major conferences in this country. In terms of emphasis upon intercollegiate athletics, the Big Ten, the Southeastern and Atlantic Coast Conferences rank at the

top with the Missouri Valley and Southern Conferences at the lower level. It is remembered that the Atlantic Coast Conference arose from members of the Southern Conference which wanted to establish a new association with members whose athletic aspirations were at a higher level.

The George Washington University is a member of the Southern Conference. Of the nine members of this group, this institution's support of athletics in terms of -grants-in-aid parallels that of William and Mary and Virginia Military Institute. At the top of the conference are Virginia Polytechnical Institute and West Virginia University. At the lower level is Davidson.

This intermediate position of George Washington is a sensible one. Our teams have played competitive contests at this level and there is no compelling reason to depart from this station.

The most frequent, adverse comment made towards participation in intercollegiate athletics has been its cost. Traditionally, intercollegiate athletics has been held to be a student activity. In recognition of this, colleges and institutions have assessed the students a fee which has been referred to most often as an activity fee. This fee helps defray the cost not only of intercollegiate athletics but also other activities such as the campus newspaper, dances, plays, etc. If this fee is not listed separately, it is generally assumed to be a part of the tuition fee. In the local area, one finds the following assessments made. American University charges \$15.00 per semester, Catholic University is \$28.00 per year, Georgetown University is \$75.00 per semester, Howard University is \$12.50 per semester and Maryland University is \$47.00 per year. In the instance of Georgetown University, the fee includes health insurance coverage.

The George Washington University had a fee of \$10.00 per semester which was eliminated during World War II and it has not been reintroduced.

Most institutions operate upon the principle that the receipts from the games plus that portion derived from the students' fees will defray the costs of support for intercollegiate athletics.

The NCAA is aware of this aspect of intercollegiate sports and it has attempted to aid schools by devising a scheme for the distribution of monies derived from the

sale of television rights for intercollegiate football games to the Columbia Broadcasting System. These rights were sold for over ten million dollars for a two year period. Another year remains before a new contract is concluded. It is anticipated that the figure may reach well over twelve million dollars when the next contract is signed.

It must be stated that the plan now in force for the division of the money favors the institutions whose emphasis on intercollegiate athletics is a major one. However, strong opposition against the continuance of the present plan has been led by the Missouri Valley Conference, the Southern Conference and other groups. Although there does not appear to be much chance of any change for the coming year, it is quite certain that significant revisions will be made in the future so that the distribution of the receipts will be on a more equitable basis.

In a related manner, the Southern Conference has adopted the position that whenever its net worth exceeds \$150,000.00, the excess will be distributed equally among the nine members. The expectation exists that this may occur during the present year.

During the University's Committee's report last April, one of the Senators requested information as to whether the allocation of funds in support of the intercollegiate athletic program might not be out of line with relation to the value derived from participation in such an activity and as to whether these funds could not be better used in support of other pressing needs.

It was and is the opinion of the Senate Committee that it is not a function for it to determine what funds should be allocated for the support of intercollegiate athletics, since a proper evaluation of this point would require an analysis of the entire budget of the University and a judgment as to what constitutes its relative importance in relation to all the activities and operations of the institution. Patently, this is beyond the scope and intent of this committee. It is a proper function of the administration and it is certainly one to which it has given full and serious thought.

The Committee feels that any faculty member is free to discuss with the administration its views on this subject. It does not seek to evade the point which

has been raised, but it believes that a fundamental question of administration is involved and that the Senate Committee is not the proper agency for the resolution of such a question.

This rather lengthy report of various aspects of intercollegiate athletics provides an insight into the many factors which enter into an evaluation of the pros and cons of this activity. The Senate Committee feels that the university's total program in athletics now in operation is in the best interests of this institution.

Intramural Athletics - The George Washington University is becoming a resident institution at a rapidly increasing rate. The number of on-campus students is rising each year and this trend will continue with the availability of additional residence hall space. Intramural athletics has served as a main channel for recreational activities of these students. During the past few years, it has become an increasingly difficult problem to provide the facilities to meet the demand which has been created by the growing student body. This has become more acute since the YMCA has withdrawn recently its permission to make available to us its gymnasiums on Sundays. A projection into the near future leaves no doubt that an activities building will be the only practical solution for the alleviation of this pressure for additional and better facilities. The Senate Committee realizes that this is one more serious need with which the administration has been and is concerned, but the committee suggests that this could be a vital factor in developing a loyalty for the university by the students which would manifest itself through support as alumni.

Physical Fitness - The National Collegiate Athletic Association has taken the lead to induce member institutions, through the cooperation of faculty representatives, to adopt the physical fitness program which has been set forth by President Kennedy's Commission on Physical Fitness. It may be recalled that this Commission was appointed as a result of the alarming increase in rejections from military service of draftees on physical grounds alone. This amounted to five rejections for every seven examined and a proportionately larger number of the rejections were university students or graduates.

The President's Commission stated that the colleges and universities of America have a serious national responsibility to develop fully the intellectual and

physical capabilities of their students.

The Senate Athletic Committee endorses this view and recommends that the appropriate university officials determine to what extent the President's Physical Fitness Program may be implemented at this institution. It is only fitting that George Washington University located in the Nation's Capital should be recognized as a leader in the intellectual and physical development of the nation's youths.

In conclusion, the committee feels that the appropriate authorities or committees of the university should examine the course of action which needs to be followed to determine the feasibility of bringing its recommendations to fruition:

- (1) The assessment of an activities fee.
- (2) The construction of an activities building.